

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-9, 13-21, 25 and 26 are pending. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and in other applications.

Claims 1-3 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,787,421 ("Nomiyama") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,913,215 ("Rubinstein"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The apparatus of claim 1 has "[a] document output unit [which] determines a manner in which . . . retrieval keywords are highlighted in [a] presented [document] in accordance with a feature index indicating an extent to which each of the retrieval keywords has contributed to the selection of the documents." The output unit highlights the retrieval keywords in the presented document "in the determined manner." These are important features of the invention.

The Office Action concedes that Nomiyama does not disclose or teach highlighting of keywords based on a feature index. It relies on Rubinstein to teach the limitation. Rubinstein says that keyword phrases found in more than one web page are displayed in a different color than those found in only one web page. Rubinstein does not suggest, however, that the differently colored keyword phrases are ever displayed as such in any of the web pages. Thus, Nomiyama and Rubinstein, even when considered together, do not suggest the invention of amended claim 1, where the retrieval keywords are highlighted in the presented document in the determined manner. For at least this reason, claim 1 should be allowable over the Nomiyama and Rubinstein combination.

Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1 and therefore, should be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 13 recites a method of retrieving documents wherein “the retrieval keywords are highlighted in [a] presented [document] in accordance with a feature index indicating an extent to which each of the retrieval keywords has contributed to the selection of the documents, and the retrieval keywords are highlighted in the determined manner.” Claim 13 contains similar limitations as claim 1 and therefore, independent claim 13 and its dependent claims 14-15 should be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 4 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomiyama in view of Rubinstein and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0174118 (“Bates”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 4 and 16 either depend from claim 1 or contain similar limitations as claim 1. Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the Nomiyama and Rubinstein combination. Therefore, claims 4 and 16 should be allowable for reasons mentioned above and for other reasons.

Claims 5, 6, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomiyama in view of Rubinstein and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,836 (“Sumita”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 5, 6, 17 and 18 either depend from claim 1 or contain similar limitations as claim 1. Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the Nomiyama and Rubinstein

combination. Therefore, claims 5, 6, 17 and 18 should be allowable for reasons mentioned above and for other reasons.

Claims 7 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomiyama in view of Rubinstein and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,168,565 ("Morita"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 7 and 19 either depend from claim 1 or contain similar limitations as claim 1. Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the Nomiyama and Rubinstein combination. Therefore, claims 7 and 19 should be allowable for reasons mentioned above and for other reasons.

Claims 8, 9, 20, 21, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomiyama in view of EAST. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 8 says the document retrieval apparatus has "a document output unit that presents the contents of one of the selected documents designated by the user; wherein the query character string input unit allows a user to designate a word *other than the retrieval keywords*, the word can be highlighted by the document output unit in the presented one of the selected documents."

EAST only discloses that a user may choose to either highlight or not highlight the search terms. It does not disclose providing an user with an option to only highlight words in a selected document. This is different than the claimed invention in which the user may prefer highlighting a word without using it as a search keyword, as explained in more detail in the specification, pages 25+. For this reason, claim 8 should be allowable over the Nomiyama and EAST combination.

Claims 9, 20, 21, 25 and 26 either depend from claim 8 or contain similar limitations as claim 8. Nomiyama does not disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claims 9, 20, 21, 25 and 26 should be allowable for reasons mentioned above and for other reasons.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: September 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,  
By \_\_\_\_\_  
Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082  
Ranga Sourirajan  
Registration No.: 60,109  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1825 Eye Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006-5403  
(202) 420-2200  
Attorneys for Applicant